

**REMARKS**


Claims 1, 9 and 10 are amended. Claims 7 and 8 are cancelled. Claims 1-6 and 9-13 remain in the case.

Claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> par., as being indefinite in failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that claim 8 is confusing and cannot be understood. Further, the Examiner indicates that claims 8-12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> par., and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of allowable claim 8 and intervening claims 7 and 1. The limitations of original claim 8 have been rewritten to make it fully understood. Claim 1, which includes the limitations of claim 8 now requires that the second axis opening has a peripheral edge and at least one portion of the peripheral edge has an inwardly directed lip, the collar has a double edged flange portion for securing to the inwardly directing lip. Claim 1 is now believed to be allowable. Claims 2 through 6 and claim 13 are dependent upon allowable claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of original claims 1, 7 and allowable claim 9. Claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of original claim 1, 7 and allowable claim 10. Claims 9 and 10, as amended, are believed to be allowable. Independent claims 11 and 12 are now believed to be allowable also.

This Amendment should place this case in condition for passage of issue.  
Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Darlene P. Condra  
condra@ybpc.com

YOUNG & BASILE, P.C.  
3100 W. Big Beaver Road, Suite 624  
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107  
(248) 649-3333